1 2

3

45

6

7

8

9

10

11

TIFFANY BRINKLEY,

12

13

v.

LLC,

14

15

16

1718

19

2021

2223

24

2526

2728

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

MONTEREY FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Defendant.

Case No.: 16-CV-1103-RSH-WVG

ORDER PARTIALLY GRANTING AND PARTIALLY DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SEAL

[ECF No. 188]

On April 7, 2022, Plaintiff filed a Motion To Seal Documents In Support Of Plaintiff's Motion For Class Certification ("Motion"). ECF No. 188. The Motion seeks to seal Exhibits 1, 3, and 16 to the Declaration of Patrick N. Keegan in support of Plaintiff's motion for class certification.

There is a presumptive right of public access to court records based upon the common law and the First Amendment. *See Nixon v. Warner Comm., Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 (1978); *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1212-13 (9th Cir. 2002). A party must demonstrate "good cause" when it seeks to file documents under seal in connection with a nondispositive motion. *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010). "For good cause to exist, the party seeking protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted." *Phillips*, 307 F.3d at 1210–11.

Good cause exists to seal Exhibits 1 and 3 to protect the privacy of the individuals included in those documents. Exhibit 1 contains thousands of names, addresses, and telephone numbers for private individuals who have no connection to this action. Exhibit 3 likewise contains telephone numbers for unrelated private persons, along with a detailed log of private telephone calls from and to Plaintiff.

Plaintiff, however, has failed to demonstrate good cause to seal the entirety of Exhibit 16, which contains Jeffrey A. Hansen's expert report ("Hansen Report"). Although Exhibit 16 may "describe[] in detail documents designated and marked 'Confidential' and 'Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only," ECF No. 188 at 2, Plaintiff has made no effort to identify or redact the specific text in the report that reveals the confidential information. Instead, the Motion seeks to seal the full report. That request is overbroad, particularly where there are many paragraphs in the report that do not cite or even mention any confidential documents. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate "specific prejudice or harm," Phillips, 307 F.3d at 1210–11 (emphasis added), as to Exhibit 16. If Plaintiff still seeks to submit any portion of Exhibit 16 under seal, she may file an additional motion to seal within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order, along with a public (redacted) version of Exhibit 16, and re-file as a "sealed lodged proposed document," in accordance with Section 2(j) of the ECF Manual a non-public, unredacted version that highlights the proposed redactions in yellow.

Finally, the Court notes that Defendant has filed a separate motion to seal its brief in support of its motion to preclude portions of the Hansen Report. ECF No. 196. That motion seeks to seal only those sections of Defendant's brief that quote the Hansen Report for the sole reason that Plaintiff has designated the Hansen Report as confidential and moved to file it under seal. *Id.* at 2-3. The Court will hold Defendant's motion to seal in abeyance until the fourteen days for Plaintiff to file a renewed motion to seal has elapsed. In the future, if any party seeks to seal a document solely because another party has designated the document as confidential, the moving party shall meet and confer with

the designating party prior to filing the motion to seal to discuss what portions must be redacted and whether a motion to seal is still necessary. WHEREFORE, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion to seal Exhibits 1 and 3. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to seal Exhibit 16. IT IS SO ORDERED. Robert & Hmis Dated: July 12, 2022 Hon. Robert S. Huie United States District Judge